

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-10. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-10, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-10.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (9).

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the above amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 30-35, 38-45, and 47-60 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 30-33, 38-40, 42, 45, 47-49, 51, 52, 54, 55, and 57 are amended; Claims 59 and 60 are added; and no claims are canceled. Support for the amendment to Claims 30 and 57 may be found in Fig. 3b, and in the original specification at page 4, lines 4-37, and page 11, lines 15-21, for example. Support for the amendment to Claim 45 may be found in the original specification at page 11, lines 15-21, for example. Support for the amendments to Claims 31-33, 38, 40, 42, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 55 is self-evident. Support for new Claims 59 and 60 may be found in Fig. 3b, and in the corresponding description of that figure, for example. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action the drawings were objected to; the specification was objected to; Claims 47-49, 51, 54, and 55 were objected to for informalities; Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs; Claims 30, 32-34, 45, 52, 56, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Cornils et al. (U.S. 5,711,119, hereinafter "Cornils"); Claims 47-49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cornils; Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cornils in view of Huchet (FR 2,814,705); and Claims 53-55 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cornils in view of Bravet et al. (U.S. 6,265,054, hereinafter "Bravet").

Applicants note with appreciation the courtesy of the interviews conducted with Examiner Ference on December 7, 2010, and February 23, 2011. During the December 7, 2010, interview, it was agreed that a new Office Action resetting the statutory period for response would be issued to correct the claim range being examined. During the February

23, 2011, interview, it was acknowledged by Examiner Ference that the pending Office Action dated February 14, 2011, should have been indicated as being a Non-Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks herein constitute a statements of the substance of these interviews, as required by M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, replacement drawings for Figs. 3b, 4b, 5-7, 8b, 9b, 9c, and 10 are submitted herewith that include reference characters for a peripheral frame or peripheral elements, and a pocket, as appropriate. Corresponding amendments are also made to the sections of specification which describe these drawings. Additionally, the replacement drawings for Figs. 2, 3a, 4a, 8a, and 9a include a legend designating them as background art, and all of the replacement drawings include lines, shading, and characters that have sufficient weight to permit adequate reproduction, as required. No new matter is added by the replacement drawings and corresponding amendments to the specification. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings is overcome, and it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification is hereby amended to state "U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0085595," as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to Claims 47-49, 51, 54, and 55, these claims are amended to include equivalent English units, as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claims 47-49, 51, 54, and 55 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of Claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, it is noted that Claim 45 no longer recites "which material is not capable of exerting any stress whatsoever on the glazed element." Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs are negated and it is respectfully requested that they be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 30, 32-34, 45, 52, 56, and 57 as anticipated by Cornils, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 30 is directed to a glazing unit that includes:

a glazed element provided with a peripheral frame or with peripheral elements, the peripheral frame or the peripheral elements including

at least one reinforcing element that reinforces the glazed element, the at least one reinforcing element having a profile including a web part arranged parallel or substantially parallel to the glazed element, the web part bearing at least two projecting parts distal to the glazed element and forming a pocket, and

plastic overmolded onto the glazed element to connect the at least one reinforcing element to the glazed element, the plastic enclosing at least a portion of the at least one reinforcing element, wherein

the pocket formed by the web part and the at least two projecting parts is not open in a direction of the glazed element.

Cornils fails to disclose plastic overmolded onto the glazed element to connect the at least one reinforcing element to the glazed element, the plastic enclosing at least a portion of the at least one reinforcing element, as recited in Claim 30. In Cornils, the profiled frame (4) is not enclosed within any other material, much less a plastic overmolded onto the glazed element (1). Furthermore, adhesive bead (13) of Cornils does not enclose at least a portion of the profiled frame, as it is insertable inside the groove (5, 6, 7) of profiled frame (4).

Cornils also fails to disclose at least one reinforcing element that reinforces the glazed element, as recited in Claim 30, because Cornils does not fairly disclose the profiled frame (4) as a reinforcing element.¹ Rather, Cornils is directed to a window pane that includes a profiled frame (4) made of a *supple* elastomer that has a groove (5, 6, 7) that interlocks with a matching adhesive fitting bead (13). The profiled frame (4) and the fitting bead (13) are is

¹ “As described above, the materials of the peripheral profiled frame and of the fitting adhesive bead as well as the shape of the groove are such that, after curing, the fitting bead can be extracted from the groove *without damage to the bead or profile*. The detached window pane can subsequently be reinstalled in its mounted position simply by applying mechanical pressure to interlock the bead into the profile.” See Cornils at col. 4, lines 46-55, for example.

made of a soft, supple elastomer so that the fitting bead (13) can be extracted from the groove (5, 6, 7) without causing damage to either the profiled frame or the fitting bead. This soft, supple elastomer is irrelevant to at least one reinforcing element that reinforces the glazed element, as recited in Claim 30.

With regard to Claim 57, this claim is directed to a reinforcing element that includes:

a profile including a web part, at least two projecting parts in a form of lateral arms, and a plastic that encloses at least a portion of the web part and the at least two projecting parts, the web part being configured to be arranged parallel or substantially parallel to a glazed element, and the web part and the at least two projecting parts defining a pocket that is not open in a direction of the glazed element.

As discussed above regarding Claim 30, in Cornils, the profiled frame (4) is not enclosed within any other material, much less a plastic overmolded onto the glazed element (1). Thus, Cornils fails to disclose a plastic that encloses at least a portion of the web part and the at least two projecting parts, as recited in Claim 57. Also, as previously discussed, Cornils does not fairly disclose the profiled frame (4) as being a reinforcing element.

Therefore, as Cornils fails to set forth each and every element of amended independent Claims 30 and 57, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 30 and 57, and any claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Cornils, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 30, 32-34, 45, 52, 56, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 47-51 and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is respectfully submitted that Claims 47-51 and 53-55 depend from independent Claim 30, and thus patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above regarding Claim 30. Furthermore, none of the other cited references, namely Huchet and Bravet, cure the deficiencies of Cornils with respect to amended independent Claim 30.

Therefore, Claim 30 patentably distinguishes over Cornils, taken alone or in proper combination with Bravet and Huchet.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 47-51 and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding new Claims 59 and 60, these claims further patentably distinguish over any proper combination of the applied art for at least the features they recite and by virtue of their dependency from Claim 30.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Richard L. Allen
Registration No. 64,830